Remarks/Arguments

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103:

Claims 1, 2, and 4-8

The Claims 1, 2, and 4-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishizuka et al. (US 6,771,235) in view of Lai (US 6,501,226).

Applicant amends independent claim 1 to more clearly characterize the claimed invention in Claims 1-2, and 4-8 and to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. More specifically, the amendment provides that the "duration of connection t'_{a1} of each electrode of the first array to said power supply means and the duration of the transfer of charge t'_{a2} … are **made dependent on a comparison** of the luminous intensity datum … **with the useful charge Q_u that has been accumulated during a just preceding sequence of connection of another electrode of the second array**." Support for the amendment is on page 14, lines 6-38 of the specification.

Applicant submits that the amended claims are patentable over these references.

It is acknowledged in the office action that Ishizuka does not disclose that this charge has been accumulated during a just prior/preceding sequence of connection of another electrode of the second array and is used to power for light emission the light-emitting cell according to Applicant's claims.

Further, it is acknowledge in the office action that Ishizuka does not disclose that, during each sequence of connection of an electrode of the second array, the duration t'_{a1} of connection of each electrode of the first array to the power supply means and the duration t'_{a2} of the transfer of charge of the intrinsic capacitors of the other light-emitting cells linked to the same electrode of the first array are a function of the luminous intensity datum of the light-emitting cell that is to be powered for light emission between this electrode of the first array and this electrode of the second array.

With the amendment to claim 1, the claims of this application are such that these durations t'_{a1} and t'_{a2} are not only dependent on the luminous intensity datum, but based on

comparison of this luminous intensity datum with the useful charge Q_u. Clearly, Ishizuka does not disclose this feature.

In order to supplement the noted deficiencies in Ishizuka, the office action uses Lai and asserts that Lai teaches "said charge has been accumulated during a just preceding sequence of connection … to allow said power supply means to power at least one of the cells" and that Lai also teaches "modulating both the duration of connection of each electrode of the first array to said power supply means and the duration of the transfer of charge of the intrinsic capacitors of the other light-emitting cells linked to the same electrode of the first array as a function of the luminous intensity datum … ."

However, Applicant respectfully points out that Lai actually does not teach nor suggest during each sequence of connection of an electrode B_2 (*"next-to-be-activated row"*) of the second array (cathode array) that the duration t'_{a1} of connection of each electrode A_2; A_3 of the first array (anode array) to the power supply means 2_2; 2_3 and the duration t'_{a2} of the transfer of charge of the intrinsic capacitors of the other light-emitting cells E_{21}; E_{31}, E_{23}; E_{33}, … , $E_{2,64}$; $E_{3,64}$ linked to the same electrode A_2; A_3 of the first array are made dependent on a comparison of the luminous intensity datum of the light-emitting cell E_{22}; E_{32} that is to be powered for light emission between this electrode A_2; A_3 of the first array and this electrode B_2 of the second array with the useful charge Q_u that have been accumulated during a just preceding sequence of connection of another electrode B_1 (*previously-activated row*) of the second array.

In Lai, the connection (per col. 6, lines 2-24 and per col. 8, lines 41-48) is performed by the switches 6_2, 6_3 in Figures 3-4 and 7-8 and the duration takes place more precisely during the "scan row lighting phase" of the next-to-be-activated row following the "scanned-row transition phase"; however, there is no transfer of charge as meant in Applicant's claims in the "scanned-row transition phase." Further, this transfer of charge takes place during the "equalization phase," i.e. before the "scan row lighting phase" of the next-to-be-activated row.

Therefore, by applying the disclosure of Lai to the device for displaying images of Ishizuka, one skilled in the art cannot reach the invention in claims 1-2 and 4-8.

Claim 9

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishizuka et al. (US 6,771,235) in view of Lai (US 6,501,226).and further in view of Aziz et al. (US 6,811,896).

Amended claim 9 depends on claim 8 and ultimately depends on claim 1. As such, claim 9 includes each of the features of claims 1 and 8, but further includes the feature of the organic electroluminescent layer having a thickness equal to or less than 0.2 μm.

However, Applicant respectfully points out that Ishizuka, Lai and Aziz in combination and individually fail not teach nor suggest some features of claim 9 which effectively include the that during each sequence of connection of an electrode B_2 (*"next-to-be-activated row"*) of the second array (cathode array) that the duration t'_{al} of connection of each electrode A_2; A_3 of the first array (anode array) to the power supply means 2_2; 2_3 and the duration t'_{a2} of the transfer of charge of the intrinsic capacitors of the other light-emitting cells E_{21}; E_{31}, E_{23}; E_{33}, … , $E_{2,64}$; $E_{3,64}$ linked to the same electrode A_2; A_3 of the first array are made dependent on a comparison of the luminous intensity datum of the light-emitting cell E_{22}; E_{32} that is to be powered for light emission between this electrode A_2; A_3 of the first array and this electrode B_2 of the second array with the useful charge Q_u that have been accumulated during a just preceding sequence of connection of another electrode B_1 (*previously-activated row*) of the second array.

As such, reconsideration of the rejection to claim 9 is requested.

Conclusion

In light of the above assertions and claim amendments, reconsideration of the rejections to each of the claims is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments that would facilitate the disposition or resolution of the issues, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at 609-734-6816.

Respectfully submitted,
Jean-Paul Dagois, Applicant

PF020145

/Richard LaPeruta/
Richard La Peruta, Jr.
Registration No. 51252
Attorney for Applicant
Phone: 609-734-6816
Facsimile: 609-734-6888

Patent Operation
Thomson Licensing
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
October 7, 2010